



City of Middletown
Records Management Commission
Minutes of November 19, 2015 Meeting

Present: Linda Bettencourt (LB), City & Town Clerk (Chair); Brig Smith (BrS), General Counsel; Eldon Bailey (EB), Acting IT Director; Pat Tully (PT), Interim Assistant Library Director, Russell Library; George Dunn (GD), Director of Emergency Management. Chris Holden (CH), Deputy Director, Public Works.

Absent: Joe Samolis, Chief of Staff; Bill Russo, Director of Public Works; Tayna Oliver-Perry, Asst. Director of Finance; Sylvia Morello, Program Budget Analyst, Finance Dept.

0. Bill Russo has appointed Chris Holden the representative on this Commission. As such, Chris has vote as well as voice.
1. Chair called the meeting to order at 1:05pm.
2. **Approval of September 24, 2015 minutes:** After a brief discussion, the Commission voted to approve the minutes with no amendments.
3. **Public Comments:** There were no members of the public present.
4. **Old Business:**

COOP plans: LB printed out a copy of all the COOP documents; at their request she will print out hard copies for GD and CH. CH did not receive the email with the documents attached; PT will send it to him.

GD noted that CVH has a COOP plan; although the development of a plan is complex and time-consuming, more and more organizations are doing it.

GD will touch base with Joe Samolis the importance of meeting with the Mayor—to get buy-in from departments for COOP plan development and records inventories the Mayor must support it.

There are many COOP documents and templates to review; however members of the Commission should review them all before determining at a future meeting which are most appropriate to use for City departments. One question to be answered is whether to use the

Federal or the non-Federal template. After the decision is made, EB suggested the Commission propose revisions using the Track Changes feature in Word, which allows multiple people to comment and propose changes to a document. Word versions of the documents would be put on a drive shared by members of the Commission, so all can participate. LS and/or GD will make final decisions on changes.

Developing a timeline for COOP and records retention projects: Can't rush the process but can't delay it too long either. The Commission will prepare a timeline in January or February; before then, it will review COOP documents, and LS & GD will meet with the Mayor. The Mayor needs to thoroughly understand the proposed projects to respond to push back from departments mandated to implement them.

Records retention: LS noted that implementing both COOP and records retention projects at the same time may not be feasible for most departments, even with the Mayor's mandate. There are 16 CT retention schedules, and most departments will have to refer to more than one of them. As Town Clerk, LS will answer questions, but is not in a position to evaluate other departments' records for record retention. GD suggested that the Town Clerk's Office present information about records retention at a Department Heads meeting, perhaps in Council chambers.

GD suggested that departments concentrate on the last 7 years of documents that may be eligible for discard. Interns from local schools may be available help departments evaluate and assign retention categories. BrS noted that for projects to begin in the summer, it will be necessary to announce this to departments in the next few months.

What about digitization? GD said this is a second priority project; once documents are categorized as to be permanently retained, they can be flagged for possible digitization. LS mentioned that microfiche is being used for some permanent record retention, but it is an expensive option.

EB said that it is essential to develop workflows for documents going forward so that they are categorized on creation and that retention become a routine part of operations. These workflows can be created by an outside company, but might be more cheaply done with a City employee hired specifically to work with departments to develop and maintain these workflows.

BrS noted that the Office of General Counsel is contracting with a company, Prime, to develop workflows for the Office. Once they have Prime's estimate, the Commission can compare those costs with the costs of doing this in-house for all City departments.

The work of EB's Commission is connected to our development of COOP plans, but separate in important ways. GD noted that the COOP plan has less to do with relocating City operations in the event of a disaster, instead focusing on identifying the most vital functions of municipal government and how to keep them running in the event of a disaster.

GD noted that for the Council to vote funding for this, they need to understand the results. In order for us in the Commission and the Council to understand all the projects we are proposing, the Commission should create a matrix of issues, projects and tasks being proposed. This is particularly important because these projects are interconnected, and connected with other City initiatives.

GD moved to create a matrix of issues, projects and tasks to be done; BrS seconded the motion, and members voted to approve it.

5. **New Business:** No new business.
6. **Other:** LS will check the availability of Rm. 208 for the next few Commission meetings—we will need the whiteboards in our review of COOP documents. PT will send Commission members a reminder to start reviewing the documents before the Dec. 16 meeting, and ask LS for print copies if they would prefer them to digital copies.

The next meeting will be on Wednesday, Dec. 16 at 1pm in Rm. 208.

7. **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 2:01pm.